Return to our Home Page
Return to our Zapruder Film Page

Jack White's "Anomalies"

UPDATE 08/03/98: *I just re-read a Q&A between Jack White and myself from May, 1998...*

CLINT: Your slide set doesn't show a weird white blob covering the President's head wound(s), does it?

JACK: Yes, it does. And the white blob changes size and shape. That is the main reason I that years ago in my slide lectures I started showing the blob sequence and suggesting that it did not appear photographic but perhaps indicated tampering. One frame shows the entire forehead forward of the ear missing. If my frames show this and other frames do not, what does it indicate?

It indicates that Jack's favorite copy of the Zapruder film - the one he likes to blow up on his wall to analyze...the one he uses to show "anomalies" - **is worthless**.

It is obviously NOT a "slide set" made from what is stored in the National Archives. The National Archives copy doesn't contain any of Jack White's "anomalies" that "prove" tampering he listed in his chapter of Assassination Science.

If we are to believe Jack White's assertions, then the National Archives' copy is edited so extraordinarily that it eliminates all of Jack's referenced "anomalies."

Or...his slide set is defective.

What do you believe?

Jack White offers a list of several "points that prove tampering" in his chapter in Assassination Science.

Yet not a single one of these "points" is evident when watching either

- David Lifton's "Research Copy" of the Zapruder film, or

- all the versions Groden offers us in The Assassination Films video, or

- the new MPI Home Video "Image of an Assassination...".

So I asked Jack White:

Jack, you are the ONLY author in Assassination Science to fully document the heritage of the copy of the Zapruder film that is under study - and you are to be commended for that.

In your chapter in Assassination Science, you offer a list of "points that prove tampering" of the Zapruder film. Yet I cannot - as a "reasonable person" with good eyesight - see any evidence of any of those points while viewing all the renditions of the Zapruder film that Robert Groden offers on his videotape, THE ASSASSINATION FILMS.

Do you have any explanation for this?

His reply, unfortunately, is disappointing...

Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 19:52:14 -0600
From: Jack White
To: Clint Bradford

Please reread the chapter I wrote. I presented a LIST OF OBSERVATIONS by myself and others of a number of seeming anomalies which needed to be addressed. I stated that some of these were merely commonsense observations, but many of them require expert study, and I specifically denied having such expertise. Lack of expertise to determine proof of tampering, however, does not disqualify me from pointing to possible areas of study. Your inaccurate antagonistic **invitation** is obviously a bait to enhance your view. You choose to disbelieve the possibility of alteration. My stance is that all anomalies should be studied till a conclusion is reached.

I will pursue my course and you may pursue yours. Your constant harassment to state which version I am studying is irrelevant and has been answered many times. My main study has been the Groden slides. I have also studied it in 8mm, 16mm, WC volumes, and many many videos. My main interest is in studying individual frames.

Because of your closed attitude, I decline to be a part of your study. I only cooperate with those with open minds.

Jack

June 16, 1998

Jack:

This is the third time (at least) I have asked you to please explain why those "anomalies" do not show up in each of Groden's renditions of the Zapruder film he offers on his video, Assassination Films.

I think it's a valid question to ask.

My invitation was not "antagonistic." I am trying to get a respected photo analyst to explain to me why so many copies of the Zapruder film do NOT show the anomalies he sees in one particular copy.

>>...but many of them require expert study, and I specifically
>> denied having such expertise...

But you have an analytical eye. I believe that to be extremely valuable.

>>Lack of expertise to determine proof of tampering, however, does not
>>disqualify me from pointing to possible areas of study.

Of course not. Heck, I have more photographic expertise than, say, Dr. Mantik. I believe I can view items with a fairly critical, "common person" eye.

>>Your inaccurate antagonistic **invitation** is obviously a bait to enhance
>>your view.

I really am sorry you feel that way. Again - and you know I have stated this publicly many times - what you have performed for the assassination research community is invaluable. But I sure cannot figure out WHY you will not try to look at Groden's video, and report your observations.

>>Your constant harassment to state which version I am studying
>>is irrelevant and has been answered many times.

My goodness, Jack - I have publicly stated many times that you are to be commended for documenting exactly what you are looking at. As recently as the post to which you are replying: "Jack, you are the ONLY author in Assassination Science to fully document the heritage of the copy of the Zapruder film that is under study - and you are to be commended for that..."

It's the several OTHER authors in Assassination Science who fail to document the heritage of what they're looking at.

>>My main interest is in studying individual frames.

I hope we will soon see your analysis of the MPI digital transfer DVD project. I hope your computer can handle a DVD player...they're less than $200. now!

>>Because of your closed attitude, I decline to be a part of your study.
>>I only cooperate with those with open minds.

Sorry you feel that way. Jim Fetzer, Dr. Mantik, and other Assassination Science authors have openly discussed these issues with me.

- Clint Bradford

Email: Clint Bradford

Return to our Home Page
Return to our Zapruder Film Page

LE 700
LE FastCounter